



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,424	08/30/2000	Mariusz H. Jakubowski	MS1-528US	2561
22801	7590	01/12/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN, TONGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/651,424	JAKUBOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tongoc Tran	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 8/10/2004. Claims 1-36 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/10/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that the cited prior art, Merkle (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,597), "discuss portions of a 64 bit clear text block being used to calculate an input to a S-box, not being used as the S-box itself". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Merkle teaches the first portion of the clear text is selected as an input to a S-box (or can be interpreted as generate S-box based on values in first portion) (e.g. Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-13 and 15-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merkle (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,597) in view of Chow (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,761).

In respect to claim 1, Merkle discloses one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by

one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

selecting a portion of clear text blocks (see Merkle, col. 2, lines 52-63);
selecting another portion of the digital good, wherein the other portion is to be encrypted; and using the portion as a substitution box (S-box) when encrypting the other portion (see Merkle, Fig. 1, col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 21).

Merkle does not explicitly discloses said clear text is digital good. However, Chow discloses using DES technique to obfuscate digital good for tamper resistant protection (see Chow, col. 10, lines 6-15 and col. 20, lines 29-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of Merkle's encryption technique with Chow's teaching of using DES to obfuscate software program to ensure program of computer software needs to be protected is tamper resistant (Chow, col. 10, lines 10-14).

In respect to claim 2, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable-media as recited in claim 1, wherein the entire digital good is to be encrypted (see Chow, col. 10, lines 1-15).

In respect to claim 3, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable media. as recited in claim 1, wherein the using comprises determining, for each group of bits of the other portion, a new group of bits based on the portion (see Merkle, col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 35).

In respect to claim 4, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the using comprises using bits of

the portion to determine a substitution sub portion for each sub-portion in the other portion (see Merkle, col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 35).

In respect to claim 5, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 4, wherein the sub-portion comprises a byte (see Merkle, col. 3, lines 22-35).

In respect to claim 6, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 1, wherein the digital good comprises a software program (see Chow, col. 10, lines 6-15).

In respect to claims 8, 17-18, the claim limitations method claims that are substantially similar to claim 1. Therefore claims 8, 17-18 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 9, 11-13 and 19-22, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially similar computer readable medium claims 2-3, 4 and 6. Therefore claims 9, 11-13 and 19-22 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 15 and 23, A method as recited in claims 8 and 17, wherein the encryption process uses a Data Encryption Standard (DES) cipher.

In respect to claim 16, the claim limitation is a computer readable medium that is substantially similar to claim 1. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claim 24, the claim limitation is a computer readable medium claim that is substantially similar to method claim 17. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

4. Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merkle (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,597) in view of Sirbu (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,144).

In respect to claim 31, Merkle discloses comprising:

Selecting portion of clear text as a substitution box (S-box) in encrypting at least a portion of a second portion of clear text to produce encrypted text (see col. 2, line 52-col. 3, line 35). Merkle does not disclose but Sirbu discloses a server production encrypts digital good; and a client to store and execute the protected digital good, the client being configured to evaluate the protected digital to determine whether the protected digital good has been tampered with (see col. 9, lines 30-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teaching of Merkle's encryption technique with the teaching of Sirbu's client's verifying received digital good to ensure that content of the digital good is received completely and correctly (Sirbu, col. 10, lines 9-11).

In respect to claim 32, Merkle and Sirbu discloses a client-server system as recited in claim 31, wherein the first digital good and the second digital good are the same digital good (see Merkle, col. 2, lines 50-63).

In respect to claim 33, Merkle and Sirbu disclose one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

decrypting at least a portion of a digital good by using another portion of the digital good as a substitution box (S-box) (see Merkle, col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 21).

In respect to claim 34, Merkle and Sirbu disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 33, wherein the decrypting is based at least in part on a Data Encryption Standard (DES) cipher (see col. 3, lines 6-21).

In respect to claim 35, Merkle and Sirbu disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 33, wherein the decrypting comprises using bits of the other portion to determine a substitution value for each value in the portion (see col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 21).

In respect to claim 36, Merkle and Sirbu disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 33 wherein the digital good includes one or more of: a software program, audio content, and video content (see Sirbu, col. 1, lines 13-25).

5. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merkle (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,597) and Chow (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,761) and further in view of Sirbu (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,144).

In respect to claim 7, Merkle and Chow disclose one or more computer readable media as recited in claim 1. Merkle and Chow do not explicitly disclose wherein the digital good includes video content. However, Sirbu discloses encrypting video content of digital goods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement

the teaching of Merkle's encryption technique to encrypt video content for secure data transmission over the insecure Internet.

In respect to claim 14, the claim limitation is a method claim that is substantially similar to computer readable media claim 7. Therefore claim 14 is rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3843. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2134

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT

January 7, 2005


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100